G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

1002 – 1892

1911.

(Madras)

Later references.

File No. 754

Serial Nos.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. /

Part B for

SUBJECT.

Pardon Discussion re. Succession to Mathas

GPB—10,000—23 3 15

1911-12

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

NOTES.

754-11
File No

FILE HEADING

Rules for succession to Mathas

From

No.	Dated	Received

No	Enclos.	Spare Copies	Serial No 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

NOTES AND ORDERS

In D.O. N° 301, dated the 11th March 1912, from the Private Secretary to His Highness the Maharaja, to the Dewan intimating His Highness' sanction to the succession of Vedamma to Sathya-Samacharya to the High Priestship of the Sri-

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB—30,000—12 8 11

G. R S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. | of 191

Serial No.	
	Uttaradi Matt, the Private Secretary says "His Highness desires that the order of 1892 may be discussed separately by yourself and the council "and the matter submitted for "orders (vide inner file 386 - 11)
⊗ H X.	File No ⊗ 102 of 1892 relating to the issue of the orders in question submitted.
	These orders have once been given effect to in the case of the Sri Uttaradi matt succession in 1904 vide para 4 of GO No. 1621 - 34 dy 9.11.04 (inner file No. 197 of 1904 putup for reference).
X X - P	
	Submitted. RL 9.5.12
X X X	The notes in File 102 - 1892 shew that on a minute of the Hon. Dewan Sri K. Sankara Iyer, the question of "succession to matts" was considered, and the Govt order prescribing rules in this behalf was passed. So far as the institutions

NOTE—Contn sheet.

Serial No.

institutions in the State are concerned, the G O does not appear to have engendered any feeling among the Matts that it has interfered with their rights or liberties On the other hand, it seems to have been acquiesced in by all those concerned, almost without exception, and there appears to be no doubt that the influence of the Govt Order has been generally very wholesome.

When the case of the succession to the Uttaradi Matt was ~~d~~ dealt with under this Order of 1892, by Prof. No 1621-34 dated 9.11.04, the Madhva Siddhanthonnahini Sabha submitted a representation ~~forgot~~ about what they considered to be the inexpediency of the Order of Govt, which ~~required~~ prescribed Govt approval as being necessary to proposed succession to Matts, and supported their request for its cancellation by elaborate arguments, (Vide petn dy 23.2.05 in File 198-04) This petition was considered ~~to~~ and, in their Order dated 9.3.06, the Govt denied that the Order objected to was either inexpedient or attended

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

with any practical difficulty, and held that there were no reasons to revise the same. (Vide para 5 of Prof. No. 3779-92 dated 9 3 06). No further representations, or objections, have come up from any quarter since, and the matter has rested there.

Lastly, in File 386-11, the question ~~has arisen~~ has formed the subject of a note by the Under-Secy, Mysore Branch, in connection with the intimation received by Govt, of the recent succession to the Uttaradi Mutt, communicated by the Senior and Junior Swamijalavaru in January 1912.

Secretary) 10 5 12

1st C

CSB 10/5/12

Please [illegible]

with [illegible]

2/5/12

LSB 22/5

Detached & kept along d. files 5/6/12 Jones 1720

Subd with Legis File No 38-11

Secs 122 27 5 12

28/5/12

To Mysore Branch (1st Councillor) 29 5 12

NOTE—Contn sheet

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

Serial No.

As at present advised, I do not think it necessary to embody this in the Mines Regn. The subject may be considered when the draft is taken up.

5/6/12

Note—Contn sheet

GPB—50,00 1—12 8 10